Intro Negation Case

I think many of you may have heard of Jimmy Kimmel, the popular comedian. According to CNN [1]: his second child was born recently, in April of 2017 and he was named William Kimmel. William was born with a very rare heart condition where his heart was not beating properly, as he was born to a successful comedian, Jimmy Kimmel, William had adequate health care, after his heart murmur was discovered he was rushed into an operating room where under intensive care and countless surgeries, his heart problem was fixed, as he grows up, he will have to undergo surgeries to account for his growth, but because he was born into an affluent family he will never have to worry about being unable to receive adequate health care. This is not the case for everyone, as shocking statistics show that not everyone is born to a father worth 35 million dollars. A child with the same heart problem, born to a family in a lower socio-economic class would not even be able to get the adequate heart surgeries at birth because the cost of their surgeries would exceed the lifetime limit provided at the status quo. With the implementation of Universal Health Care, or UHC for short, no child would get the adequate surgery needed for their heart, all of them would die.

Hello everyone I am Arjun Chopra and my partner, Sam (pitch kad ze) stand in strong negation of the resolution: Resolved: the United States government should fully fund universal health care coverage.

I would like to provide a road map of my three contentions: contention one, Universal health care would hurt the economy, Contention two, Universal Health Care would not save lives, instead will let thousands of people die and Contention three, the implementation of Universal Health Care would be unconstitutional.

As I support the con case the pro side will bear the burden of proof and must, in the following constructive speech prove that universal health care will benefit the men, women and children of our country.

Contention one, the implementation of a single payer system would deal an immense blow to our economy by destroying the insurance industry, increasing the national debt, and heavily taxing the public.

Subpoint one: According to Market realist [2] destroying the massive 1.25 trillion dollar Health insurance industry, and according to The Insurance Information Institute [3] will put two and a half million people out of a job.

Subpoint two: Additionally, according to the national debt clock [4] our national debt is 19 trillion dollars, and goes up by over a hundred thousand dollars a second, by the time this speech is over our national debt would have increased by 24 million dollars, and according to USAtoday [5] it would take an average American 463 years to work of the debt that the US accumulated in just four minutes, the implementation of universal health care would only increase this debt significantly, slowly drowning this great country in trillions of dollars of debt.

Contention two, A universal health care system is a system that sounds very appealing and flashy, and as the pro may state without health care many people will die, true, I don’t disagree with that, but, even with a universal health care system thousands of people would die. The implementation of such a system would cause the availability of health care to go down, and waiting lists would form for the simple screening for diseases. For example in a study conducted by the Fraser Institute [7] found that the average wait time is 20 weeks in 2016, and has increased by 8.5 percent since 2015, and the wait time for a neurosurgery is nearly a year. This has happened in many other countries, for example the UK, a country with a population of only one fifth of that of the US calculated by the Office for National Statistics, in their universal health care system 50,000 people die in a year according to the NHS [8], extrapolating that to match the US, 250,000 people would die on waiting lists in the US, does that sound very American, our country was founded on the principles of life liberty and the pursuit of happiness, implementing universal health care would take life away from 250,000 Americans every year, and will take liberty away from Americans for ever.

And finally Contention three: According to the National Constitution Center [9] The tenth amendment states: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. This, in essence, means that if something is not defined by federal law, then, it is to be defined by the states, or, although very rare, are to be defined by a referendum. Our federal law does not give the power of universal health care to the federal government, instead it gives it to the states, therefore, to implement UHC would be unconstitutional.

In conclusion, the pro side would argue that Universal Health Care would benefit our country, but that’s not true, not only is it unconstitutional, but it will also fail to save lives, and it would actually put more people at risk of death than the status quo. Despite being unable to save lives, it would cost the government, and the American people trillions of dollars, dealing a blow to the economy so large that the economy may never recover. For these reasons I implore the judges to vote a con ballot. Thank you.

( On debt make sure to enumerate that were either raising taxes, or raising taxes but not as severely while simultaneously borrowing. So say you have to pick one and both are econmically detrimental.)